



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,973	10/27/2000	Jose' C. Brustoloni	10-6	8303

22046 7590 06/07/2004

LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.
DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
101 CRAWFORDS CORNER ROAD - ROOM 3J-219
HOLMDEL, NJ 07733

EXAMINER

TRAN, ELLEN C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/698,973

Applicant(s)

BRUSTOLONI ET AL.

Examiner

Ellen C Tran

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

NORMAN M. WRIGHT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: original application filed 27 October 2000, with acknowledgement of continuing date 28 October 1999.
2. Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, and 21 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language

4. **Claims 1-4, 10-13, and 19-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Borella et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,697,354 (hereinafter '354).

As to independent claim 1, “A method comprising: receiving a request from a client at a network address translator (NAT) that defines for a protocol not directly supported by the NAT” is taught in '354 col. 3 line 64 through col. 4, line 15;

“a generalized port number (GPN) associated with that unsupported protocol and its location in each packet” is shown in '354 col. 13, lines 15-40;

“creating an entry in a translation table of the NAT that defines for that protocol an association between a client's private IP address and GPN, a NAT's assigned global IP address and GPN, and a foreign IP address” is disclosed in '354 col. 13, lines 47-53;

“said entry being used for translating in outgoing packets received by the NAT from the client using that protocol and having the foreign IP address as their destination, the client's private source IP address and GPN to the NAT's global IP address and GPN, respectively” is taught in '354 col. 14, lines 52-63;

“and for translating in incoming packets sent from the foreign IP address using that protocol to the NAT's global destination IP address and GPN, the NAT's global destination IP address and GPN to the client's private destination IP address and GPN, respectively” is shown in '354 col. 13, line 64 through col. 14, line 6.

As to independent claim 2, this claim contains substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 3, this claim contains substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 4, **“herein the entry further defines an expiration time until which the entry is valid for translating packets”** is disclosed in '354 col. 4, lines 14-15.

As to independent claim 10, this claim is directed to the translator of method 1 is rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 11, this claim is directed to the translator of method 2 is rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 12, this claim is directed to the translator of method 3 is rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 19, this claim is directed to a computer readable medium of method 1 is rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 20, this claim is directed to a computer readable medium of method 2 is rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 21, this claim is directed to a computer readable medium of method 3 is rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 13 and 22 these claim contains substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 4 above and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-9, and 14-18, 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '354 as applied to claims 1-3, 10-12, and 19-21 in further view of Devine et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,631,402 (hereinafter '402).

As to dependent claim 5, the following is not taught in '354 "wherein the unsupported protocol is a protocol in the IP Security (IPSec) security protocol suite" however '402 teaches "a secure TCP/IP communications link 22 is established to one of several Web servers" in col. 9, lines 6-18.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify dynamic network translation taught in '354 to include a means to maintain establish secure internet sessions. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to increase user flexibility see '402 (col. 2, lines 3 et seq.) "It would also be highly desirable to provide a Intranet/Internet/Web-based reporting system infrastructure capable of proving for the secure initiation, acquisition and presentation of customer from any computer workstation running a browser located anywhere in the world".

As to dependent claim 6, "wherein the unsupported protocol in the IPSec security suite is the Internet Security Association and Key Management Protocol (ISAKMP) and the GPN is an initiator cookie leased from the NAT to be unique to the client" is taught in '402 col. 33, line 50 through col. 34, line 15 "The next protion indicates the Session key 125 which is the unique session key of "cookie" provided by the Web browser".

As to dependent claim 7, "wherein the leased initiator cookie is chosen by the NAT to be used as both the client's GPN and the NAT's GPN" is disclosed in '402 col. 34, lines 16-25 "Additionally, the common protocol header section includes an

Art Unit: 2134

indication of dispatcher-assigned serial number 135 that is unique across all dispatcher process and needs to be coordinated across processes (like the Web cookie”.

As to dependent claim 8, “wherein the unsupported protocol in the IPSec security suite is the AH or ESP protocol in either the tunnel or transport modes, and the GPN is an incoming Security Parameter Index (SPI) leased from the NAT to be unique to the client” is taught in ‘402 col. 15, line 50 through col. 16. line 11 “In preliminary steps, a user first establishes communication with the DMZ Web server at step 602 and longs on to the nMCI Interact system ... to perform security validation and authenticate the user ID and password ... It is understood that all communication to the StarOE server is via TCP/IP with a Unix process listening on a known TCP port”

As to dependent claim 9, “wherein the leased SPI is chosen by the NAT to be used as both the client’s GPN and the NAT’s GPN” is shown in ‘402 col. 34, lines 16-25 “Additionally, the common protocol header section includes an indication of dispatcher-assigned serial number 135 that is unique across all dispatcher process and needs to be coordinated across processes (like the Web cookie”.

As to dependent claims 14-18 and 23-27 these claim contains substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 5-9 above and are rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2134


Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ellen C Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-8917. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.

Ellen Tran,
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2134
18 May 2004


NORMAN M. WRIGHT
PRIMARY EXAMINER